

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 7 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tavor (US 2001/0032077) in view of Tell (US 2004/0054614). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection with respect to the claims as amended.

Representative claim 1 is directed to a product information contrast system which contrasts a plurality of items of product information that include specifications indicating properties of products. The product information contrast system comprises a number of elements in combination. The claimed combination includes product information management, threshold setting, judgment, display control, and display control information management units. The product information management unit manages the plurality of items of product information of the products including a criterion product. The threshold setting unit stores a numerical threshold value for the product information items of the criterion product. The threshold value includes a percentage value inputted into the threshold setting unit by an administrator and provided to determine whether specifications of the product information items of the criterion product indicate any of a newly set property, an omitted property, and an out-of-range property when compared with specifications of the product information items of the products. The judgment unit determines whether a numerical product property indicated by the specifications in the product information items of the criterion product is different from a corresponding numerical product property indicated by specifications in the product information items of at least one of the products managed by the product information management unit, based on the numerical threshold value received from the threshold setting unit. The display control unit displays a visually recognizable alarm display indication of the newly set property, the omitted property, or the out-of-range property in the specifications of the product information items of the criterion product based on results of the determination of the judgment unit. The display control information management unit manages display control information to control the alarm display indication based on the numerical threshold value and a predetermined

range of the numerical threshold value. The display control unit is configured to display the visually recognizable alarm display indication of the newly set property, the omitted property, or the out-of-range property, based on both the results of the determination of the judgment unit and the display control information managed by the display control information management unit. In the foregoing narrative of claim 1, underlining has been added to emphasize particular claim language of the combination. As explained below, at least these features of claim 1 provide distinctions over the cited references.

Neither Tavor (US 200 1/0032077) nor Tell (US 2004/0054614) discloses or suggests the features of, in combination with other elements of the claim, “storing a numerical threshold value for the product information items of the criterion product” and “displaying the visually recognizable alarm display indication of the newly set property, the omitted property, or the out-of-range property, based on both the results of the determination of the judgment unit and the display control information managed by the display control information management unit” as recited in claim 1. Similar rationale and arguments apply to claim 7 which contains corresponding language.

Tavor teaches a method comprising: retrieving from storage data entries corresponding to the specified items, each data entry including a name, a topic, and information associated with the topic; among the retrieved entries comparing information associated with respective topics; and constructing one or more natural language sentences that reflect results of said retrieving and said comparing. Tavor describes at paragraph [0023] that several types of data need to be defined and the first data entries are the topics by which the comparison is to be made. In short, Tavor discloses making the comparison of the information associated with respective topics. Tavor does not teach a “criterion product” as in the claimed invention and does not teach or suggest the feature of “storing a numerical threshold value for the product information items of the criterion product” as in the claimed invention.

Tavor describes at paragraph [0025] that the topic “taste” is examined assuming the range is “sweet” to “dry”, to determine a natural language output. Tavor does not teach or suggest the feature of “displaying a visually recognizable alarm display indication of the newly set property, the omitted property, or the out-of-range property, based on both the results of the determination of the judgment unit and the display control information” as in the claimed invention.

Tell goes on to describe at paragraph [0059] that the 10% illustrated (the threshold percentage) would display those securities in the client’s portfolio where the financial institution has experienced an aggregate 10% increase or decrease in settled short positions over the time period indicated. The teaching of Tell is to determine whether a change of the securities of the single financial institution over the time period is larger than the threshold percentage. Tell does not cure the deficiencies of Tavor noted above.

Among other things, a prima facie case of obviousness must establish that the asserted combination of references teaches or suggests each and every element of the claimed invention. In view of the distinctions of claim 1 noted above, at least one claimed element is not present in the asserted combination of references. Again, corresponding arguments apply to the rejection of claim 7. Hence, the Office Action fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness vis-à-vis claims 1 and 7.

In summary, as neither Tavor nor Tell, singularly or in combination, disclose or suggest a product information contrast system including, in combination, a threshold setting unit storing a numerical threshold value for the product information items of the criterion product or a display control unit is configured to display the visually recognizable alarm display indication of the newly set property, the omitted property, or the out-of-range property, based on both the results of the determination of the judgment unit and the display control information managed by the display control information management unit, claims 1 and 7 are patentably distinguishable thereover.

For at least the above reasons, the asserted combination of Tavor and Tell does not teach or suggest all the elements of independent claims 1 and 7. Insofar as neither Tavor nor Tell, singularly or in combination, discloses or suggests the subject matter of independent claim 1 and insofar as dependent claims 2-4 all depend from claim 1, it follows that those dependent claims are also allowable. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no.

116692005100.

Dated: April 8, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By Alex Chartove
Alex Chartove

Registration No.: 31,942
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 400
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 760-7744